



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

most pleasant and instructive way. The discourse by Dr. Philip S. Moxom on the "Moral and Social Aspects of War" was one of the ablest which we have ever heard on that subject. Dr. Grammer's address on the "Religious Principles of the Peace Movement," though prepared in two weeks time, delighted all who heard it.

A full report of the proceedings of the Peace Congress, including all the papers read, will be published as early as possible. Notice will be given in the *ADVOCATE* when the Report is ready. It will be sold at a price just sufficient to cover the expense of publication.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The extra session of Congress met on the 7th of August. President Cleveland sent in his special message at once, which, after an exposition of the unfortunate workings of the so called Sherman statute of the 14th of July, 1890, recommended the prompt repeal of the silver-purchase provisions of this act. The debate on the subject began almost immediately in both Houses of Congress, and continued till the 28th of August. On this date the Wilson repeal bill was passed in the House of Representatives by the surprising majority of 130 in a total vote of 350. This vote, when announced, was received with great pleasure throughout the land, except by the free-silver men. It was a splendid victory for sound money.

The International Socialist Congress at Zurich passed a resolution commending universal peace. A proposition was also made that in the event of war a general strike of workmen should be declared. This proposition was voted down, but it is not improbable that such a resolution may pass in their meeting next year. A general strike of workmen would paralyze any war. The Socialists are doing much for the cause of peace. In their congresses Frenchmen and Germans meet in perfect friendliness, and prove that they can easily rise above international animosity and treat each other as brethren.

Minister Blount's report on Hawaiian affairs was received by Secretary Gresham on the 3d of August. It is understood that the subject will not be taken up for decision until the present financial discussions are over. The administration is having difficulty in finding some one willing to accept the position of minister to Hawaii.

The French blockade of Bangkok was raised on the 2d of August. The trouble does not seem, however, to be at

an end. The French demands, since formulated in twelve articles, are such that as yet Siam has not agreed to accept them.

A battle between French and Italian workmen took place at Aigues Mortes in the south of France on the 17th of August, in which about forty-five persons, mostly Italians, were killed, and at least sixty-five wounded. The event awakened great feeling throughout Italy, but the French government through the President of the Council expressed its great regret, promised to bring the offenders to justice and suspended the syndicate of Aigues Mortes. Thus the matter ended.

Republicanism has been more or less problematical in France ever since the downfall of the Empire in 1871. But at each succeeding election it has made substantial gains. In the recent general election the Conservatives, in the first two ballots, have been, it would seem, hopelessly defeated, having elected less than one-eighth of the whole number of deputies returned.

The storms which swept the Atlantic coast on the 24th and 30th of August were unusually severe and caused great loss of life and property. The Sea Islands off South Carolina were the greatest sufferers, the inhabitants being left in a helpless and starving condition.

### LETTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE ASSOCIATION TO THE PEACE WORKERS IN FRANCE.

The following letter has been addressed by the International Arbitration and Peace Association of London to the Peace workers in France.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE  
ASSOCIATION, 40 & 41 Outer Temple,  
LONDON, W.C., July 28, 1893.

DEAR FRIEND:

At the fortnightly meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, held on the 18th instant, the present state of public opinion in France regarding the supposed attitude of the British Government and people towards France, came under consideration.

Our Committee has always been strongly of opinion that if armed conflicts are to cease between civilized nations,—especially between those which enjoy political liberty,—the result must be brought about by the action of the people themselves, independently of that of governments and rulers. It seems to us unreasonable to suppose that the possibility of war will cease so long as any one nation cherishes towards another nation sentiments of mistrust, suspicion and dislike. We think it necessary to lay stress upon this elementary truth, because we consider that members of Peace Societies too

frequently forget it. Abstract denunciations of War will not do much towards its cessation, so long as nations attribute to each other motives and purposes which imply bad faith, immoderate ambition and unjust claims.

Moreover, it has always appeared to us that the position of France and England in the march towards a higher condition of human society, and the influence which they can exercise for good in the world, if united,—or for evil if in conflict, makes it a matter of the first necessity to themselves and to the world, that they should understand each other; and be united in the closest ties of mutual confidence and friendship.

Our Committee have no hesitation in saying that these sentiments prevail among the great mass of the English people; and have done so, for the last thirty, or thirty-five years. The old feelings towards France, engendered by centuries of War, have now disappeared; while the growth of political liberty in France and the brilliancy of the national genius, make her the subject of general admiration. It is, therefore, with a feeling of bewildered surprise and of great regret that, from time to time, there appears to manifest itself in France a wide-spread sentiment of dislike towards the British people and their government,—if any correct inference can be drawn from the tone of the Paris Press. Our Committee are quite ready to admit that they may labor under a misapprehension on this head; and they would eagerly receive any assurance from their colleagues in France that such is the case. Indeed, the main object of this letter is, first, to enquire whether that press rightly represents the views of the French people at large respecting the people of Great Britain. In the second place, if it be true that there is at present in your country grave distrust and dislike towards this country, we think it essential to learn from you upon what facts that feeling is based; and what suggestions you would make in order to bring about more cordial relations.

With respect to the question of French relations with Siam, which has seriously pre-occupied the minds of men on both sides of the Channel during the last few weeks, we do not intend to make any observations. Our Committee will not attempt to judge of a political situation without knowing all the facts. Moreover, we are too conscious of the grave faults committed by our own governments towards weaker races, in the shape of aggression upon their territory, to feel justified in criticising the action of other countries whenever that too much resembles our own. We have one remark, however, to make, which is closely connected with the subject of this letter: We observe that the French Press asserts that public opinion is strongly moved and irritated on this side of the Channel against the French Government. If, however, your colleagues in France had before them leading articles on this subject published in our principal newspapers, you would find them to be singularly moderate and pacific in tone.

In the last sentence, we have given an illustration of an evil which is directly connected with our subject. We refer to the fact that the real nature of articles in the English Press are so frequently misunderstood or misrepresented to the French public. How that evil is to be reduced or corrected, is a question well worthy the consideration of all Peace Societies. We may add that at critical occasions, the *ipsissima verba* of leading French journals are quoted in the chief London papers.

The strongest proof, we think, of our being justified in inviting your attention to this subject is the treatment which the British Ambassador—Lord Dufferin—has received on the part of the Paris Press. We think that we express the opinion of men of all parties in this country, when we say that no public man stands higher than Lord Dufferin in the esteem and regard of his fellow countrymen. He is a statesman possessing, not only most brilliant abilities and very wide experience in public affairs; but a man whose character is of the finest moral quality; to whom falsehood, chicanery or intrigue would be utterly impossible. Moreover, it will be remembered by some of our friends with what splendid eloquence he addressed the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris on the subject of Peace in general, and of the necessity for close friendship between England and France, in particular.

It is, therefore, a matter for most painful surprise to the British people that this statesman should have been attacked by many French journals in so violent a manner that he has felt it due to himself and to the nation which he represents to quit Paris for a time. You are perfectly aware that the person of an Ambassador (as representing in himself the nation which deposes him) has always been considered sacred from insult or unjust aspersions. We ought to add, that the charges brought against him—so far as we are acquainted with them,—could not by any possibility have had the slightest foundation.

The serious aspect of the matter lies in the fact that such charges are, in fact, indirectly aimed at the people and the government which sends the Ambassador. Our nation must, in a word, share the responsibility of such charges as have been made against Lord Dufferin.

We trust, therefore, that you and your fellow-citizens working with you for Peace, may not consider this letter either unnecessary or out of place. We hold that the first and most urgent duty of Peace Societies in different countries is, by close interchange of facts and opinions, to enable their respective countries to know and appreciate each other better. Our Committee has often made suggestions, during the last twelve years, with that object. You are aware, perhaps, that, at the very outset of our work, we conceived the idea of covering Europe with committees or societies which should correspond with each other for the above purpose. It does not seem to us that the idea has as yet been adequately realized, and we take this opportunity of asking some of our principal fellow-workers on the Continent to favor us with their opinions and suggestions on this important point.

Among many schemes which we have had before us, is the following:—and we should feel grateful for your opinion respecting it.

In Paris, as in other capitals, there are resident citizens of various foreign nations who form themselves into national Chambers of Commerce. The members of such Chambers are selected for their large international experience and special abilities. Would it be possible, do you think, to constitute in Paris—as well as in other cities—a small International Committee, consisting of men chosen from these several Chambers? In addition to two or three representatives of the country where they are found, such committees should be composed of representatives of various nationality selected from these “Chambers;” and their duty would be to meet to consider any dispute or misunderstanding which might arise

between the country where such committee exists and any foreign country. For instance, if such a committee had been sitting in Paris during the last twelve months, it might have been possible, perhaps, that it should have exercised a calming and rectifying influence on public opinion in France in regard to many charges brought against the British people and government. As one example, several months ago, it was stated in Paris that the British people were intriguing against France in Siam; and our Association immediately addressed Lord Rosebery on the subject. Our Minister for Foreign Affairs at once replied that such conduct was contrary to the policy and practice of British Agents. Would it not have been of use, if such an International Committee as we have suggested could have made that authoritative reply from an esteemed statesman widely known throughout France?

We will not apologize for addressing this lengthy communication to you, our esteemed fellow-worker. We are sure that you will see the grave importance of the question which it raises,—affecting that international unity for which we must work, as the ultimate goal of our efforts. We shall deeply value and attentively study whatever reply you may be so kind as to send us. With great regard and esteem,

Yours faithfully,  
HODGSON PRATT, (*Chairman*).  
J. FRED GREEN, (*Secretary*).

*Continued from page 201.*

This resolution was also adopted by the House of Representatives.

On June 16 of this year a resolution was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Cremer, which, after being amended by the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, was unanimously adopted. This resolution expressed the satisfaction with which the House of Commons had learned of the above resolution passed by the Congress of the United States and concluded as follows:

“And that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that her Majesty’s government will lend their ready coöperation to the government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolution.”

Our ambassador at London, Mr. Bayard, in notifying the State Department of the passage of this resolution, having been himself present when it was adopted, writes that “The debate was participated in by the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, and many other members, without regard to party affiliations, and was entirely above the usual range of ordinary parliamentary expressions. . . . This debate and the adoption of the resolution by the House, with the unanimous concurrence of all parties, is exceedingly encouraging to all who desire the substitution of reason for force in the arbitrament of international questions and as the proper basis of human government under all its conditions.”

Under instructions from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain the British Ambassador at Washington in communicating to the government of the United States this resolution adopted by the House of Commons states that “Her Majesty’s government have pleasure in bringing these resolutions to the knowledge of the government of the United States.” Both of the great English-speaking nations have thus formally recognized

the desirability of international arbitration, not only in special cases, but as a general principle of international relations. Without disparagement to the claims of other nations, I think that we may all agree that the first steps towards establishing international arbitration upon a solid and permanent basis cannot be more properly taken than by these two great countries united by a common blood and a common history, whose future interests lie so closely together, and which now include so large a portion of the earth’s surface and so great a number of its inhabitants beneath their flags.

At the close of Mr. Quincy’s address responses were given from England, Germany, Austria, Italy, Sweden, China, Africa, Turkey and Denmark, respectively by Dr. W. Evans Darby, Dr. Adolf Richter, Madame Wisinger, Hector Patrizi, Dr. J. Müller, Mr. Pung Kwang Yu, Prince Momolu Massaquoi, Madame Korana and Madame Nico Beck Meyer. These responses were all very interesting and much enjoyed by the audience, those of Dr. Richter, Dr. Darby and Prince Momolu especially so.

We regret that failure to receive the stenographer’s notes makes it impossible for us to give the substance of these speeches. They will appear in the full Report of the Congress.

Adjourned.

TUESDAY, August 15th.

The Congress assembled in the Hall of Columbus at 10 A. M., under the presidency of Hon. Josiah Quincy.

Prayer was offered by William G. Hubbard, of Columbus, Ohio.

The Secretary of the Congress then read the following letters and parts of letters from various persons unable to be present.

Sir Joseph Pease, President of the London Peace Society:

MY DEAR FRIEND:

I am in receipt of your letter of the seventeenth, and I beg you will convey to the Committee of the Chicago Peace Congress my sincere thanks for the honor they have done me in electing me as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Congress to be held on August fourteenth and following days.

I have watched with interest and great satisfaction the efforts that are being made to take advantage of the Chicago Exhibition to promote the cause of Peace and Unity among nations, and no more suitable opportunity than this could be found for a great Congress of the peoples of the world such as you describe.

I very much regret that there is no possibility of my coming to Chicago this year. It is doubtful whether the present session of Parliament will have come to an end by the fourteenth of August, and in any event my engagements here are so numerous that I cannot see my way to leaving home at the time.

Had it been in my power nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to be present, and to add my testimony as President of the English Peace Society, to what I believe is the great and growing feeling in favor of the